

trailers, that never got delivered to the people that needed them, but the taxpayers sure paid for them.

We see how we have wasted money on homeland security and the borders and the airports, and they are still not secure. The ports certainly are not secure enough. The list goes on and on. The administration's track record for no-bid contracts, for waste in contracting, for lack of oversight in contracting is truly appalling; and we talked in a press conference 2 weeks ago, the Truth Squad did, about these egregious behaviors.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time for accountability. It is time to audit the books. The Blue Dogs that serve in Congress are fully committed to this. The Democratic Caucus is fully committed to this. It is time that the entire Congress be committed to this.

Mr. ROSS, I will close tonight's activities with one last thought, and that is that we owe the taxpayers more than we are giving them with the jobs we are supposed to do. We should be accounting for their money every single day we are here.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), co-chair for communications for the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, for his leadership within the Blue Dog Coalition and for his efforts through legislation to restore accountability to our Nation's government.

Mr. Speaker, no business in our country could succeed financially if it failed to fully report back to its shareholders on how it is spending its money. However, that is exactly, as we have learned tonight from Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. TANNER, how our Federal Government is operating. The administration is not telling its shareholders, the American taxpayers, how it spends the money coming into Washington.

In 2004, \$25 billion of Federal Government spending went absolutely unaccounted for according to the Treasury Department. The Bush administration was unable to determine where the money had gone, how it was spent, or what the American people got for their tax money. Even worse, the Republican-controlled Congress failed to hold the executive branch accountable for this omission. And through these common sense pieces of legislation, we plan to hold every Federal agency accountable for how it spends America's tax money.

The next year, the GAO reported that 18 of the 24 Federal agencies have such bad financial systems that they don't even know the true cost of running some of their programs. Yet Republican leaders in Congress did not force these agencies to fully account for how the money was being spent before doling out billions more of your tax money to the same programs.

Clearly, Congress has failed to ask serious questions about the Bush administration's fiscal irresponsibility and record-high deficits 4 years in a row that have now pushed the Federal debt to well over \$8.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to hold this administration and this Congress accountable for its reckless behavior. I believe Congress must act now to renew its constitutional responsibility to serve as a check and balance for overspending, waste, fraud and financial abuse within the executive branch.

Again, Mr. Speaker, tonight in the past hour this number here increased by a little over \$41 million. Our national debt is \$8,518,180,439,082. The national debt in America is \$8,518,180,439,082. And that number, Mr. Speaker, during the hour that we have been here talking about restoring fiscal discipline and commonsense to our Nation's government, has increased by over \$41 million.

It is time for this Congress to restore accountability to our Federal Government. This is not about beating up Republicans. I don't care if Democrats or Republicans are in control; I am going to hold them accountable. I am going to hold them accountable for how they spend American taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we stand before you not only talking about the problem but offering up common sense solutions that demand accountability within our government. The time has come to restore commonsense and fiscal discipline and accountability to the government of the United States of America.

□ 2100

THE ATTACKS ON SEPTEMBER 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and the honor to be recognized on the floor of the United States Congress, and the opportunity to address you, Mr. Speaker, and the people that are listening in around the country.

You know, as I listen to the message that has been delivered here by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I think we share a sentiment in balancing a budget one day. We don't always share exactly the same sentiment on how to get there, but I am looking for black ink, and I intend to be in this Congress to approve a black ink budget.

I want to say that to my colleague from Arkansas one of the ways I would do that is tighten down this spending. In fact even on a discretionary budget, Mr. Speaker, if we just spent 95 percent of the money we spent this year we would have had a balanced budget. That is one way we can get there. We need to present a balanced budget and go from there.

But I want to support the gentleman in his philosophy, and I am not for raising taxes, I am for doing it by restricting our spending, because we need

to keep this growth run going. We are something like 17 consecutive quarters of growth. I am confident they have averaged over 3 percent. There have been only been about two quarters, and I can only think of one where our revenue was less than a 3 percent growth. This is an astonishing success for our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight, though, to talk about September 11, the fifth year anniversary to commemorate this day that passed us yesterday, and to renew our resolution to defend our people in this country and to promote freedom and to defeat our enemies.

One of the things that happened, though, in reference to the debate that took place in just the previous hour, was our Pentagon was hit, we had a plane that was heroically taken to the ground in Pennsylvania, and we had the planes that went into the Twin Towers and shut off our financial centers in the United States.

It was a direct assault on free enterprise capitalism. It was a direct assault on our financial markets, and it did shut down our markets for a short period of time. It also required us to spend billions of dollars in security in this country.

So, our spending went up, our revenue went down, the economy was starting to drop down into a recession mode, and the President stepped up and took a leadership role. Some of that leadership role was to mobilize troops and send them to Afghanistan. Some of that leadership role was to deal with the impending financial crisis.

By doing so, we addressed the tax cuts to stimulate this economy. Who would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that those tax cuts that were implemented the following year, and the second round that we did here in 2003, would have put us on this run for this unprecedented economic growth?

We have a strong economy, we have recovered from the attack on our financial center, we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars just in our national security, our domestic security, as well as additionally our additional costs in taking that fight to the enemy, taking the tip of the spirit of the Middle East and elsewhere. It has cost a lot of money to move forward in this global war against these terrorists.

Yet, the economy in the United States is strong. Mr. Speaker, not only do we have a strong economy, an economy that I believe, if it hadn't been for the attacks on the United States, if we hadn't had to spend the money militarily, if we hadn't had to spend the money for our domestic security, create this expensive airport security that we have, I believe our budget would have balanced. In fact, the economy has grown so well that we actually have our revenue stream has gone up by \$274 billion more than was anticipated and estimated.

That is the kind of rebound that this economy has done. That is the way to

balance this budget, control the spending, not increase the taxes. Let the economy grow us out of this, show fiscal discipline.

I am one of the people that has called for more fiscal discipline. We always have to do that. We have to continue to be the conscience here because everybody's project always seems reasonable to them. They probably are reasonable. But when you add them all in the aggregate, that is when we have to start slicing some of them out. We have been doing that more and more.

But I think we should have tightened our belt more back in 2003 when we engage the enemy in Iraq. We should have said to the American people, you are going to have to sacrifice. You are going to have to tighten your belt. We are going to reduce our domestic spending, at least the increases, and we are going to give our military everything that they need, and we are willing to all of us pull together as a Nation, Mr. Speaker.

But had it not been for September 11, this would not be a budget discussion going on here in this previous hour, because it would be in the black, and there would not be complaints. That is my belief, and I think we are getting there now anyway. I think it is closer than most people will predict. It depends a little bit then on how the elections turn out here in November.

But we are here today, just a day after the 5-year anniversary of the horrible and tragic attack on September 11. On that day, each person that is alive in America today that was around then remembers where they were. They remember the shock. They remember the pictures as they came out on television. Most of us saw this unfold as it went online.

Most of us got the news, found our way to a television, and stood there mesmerized as the smoke poured out of the towers and as the first one went down and then the second. Most of us watched and prayed for those who were in the towers, and for their families. Most of us believed that there would be significant survivors that would be treated in medical units, and most of us were sadly informed that there weren't going to be wounded arriving. Most of them either were killed outright or got away clean without injury.

But on that day, as the casualties estimate went up, and the first numbers that I heard, as I recall, were about 10,000 was the prediction, and now we know that number is lower than that. But that 10,000 number of projected killed in those attacks went on up to 15,000, to 20,000, on up to 30,000 was the highest number that I heard.

I can still recall what it felt like to think about the concept of 30,000 Americans, burned to ashes in the inferno of that attack by al Qaeda on our Twin Towers. I remember that feeling. I also remember the feeling of gradual relief as the real estimates came down from 30,000 now to 25,000 to 20,000 to 15,000 to 10,000 and finally settled down. Actu-

ally, the number that I have is 2,973, all tragic, all human beings, sacred lives with unique value, dashed to death that day, and all of them with family friends or loved ones, most with all of those. Those families have lived with the horror of that day. The prayers of this Nation and the prayers of the world have gone out to them, Mr. Speaker.

But as that number went down from 30,000 to 20,000 to 10,000 and then down to 3,000 now, that equation of relief, in my mind, was palpable. Today I can still feel it.

But on the other side of the ledger was also the realization that the lower the number went, the shorter would be our attention span, and the weaker would be our resolve.

As the 30,000 number settled down to 3,000, our resolve also was strong that day, and it stayed strong for a long time afterwards, but it is diminishing now in proportion to the loss of those lives. We cannot allow ourselves to settle into complacency, Mr. Speaker. We cannot allow ourselves to tell ourselves that this will go away, that they will quit attacking us if we just leave them alone, that somehow we could apologize to the people who attacked us, and find a way to understand them better. Maybe if America would convert to Islam, we could find a way to find peace with these people.

But it is not to be, not by this proud, free people, not by this proud, free Nation. This Nation will never capitulate to threats. I interviewed a World War II veteran, who had served just outside the battle of Bataan, and I think about a commander there, when he demanded that he surrender, and his answer was, nuts.

That is our attitude here in America, nuts. We don't ever do that. We take it to you. You have attacked us. We are going to remain a proud, free Nation. Our streets will be free and they will be open, and this will be an open society, and we refuse to cower. We refuse to retreat from the rest of the world and curl up in a national fetal position. We will defend our schools and our hospitals and our ball games and our theaters.

Essentially, the condition that Israel is in today, where they have to guard everything, that will not be America. Because we will take this a little to you, and it will be over, this war will be over when we change the habitat that breeds the kind of venom and terror that attacked us on September 11.

But 5 years later, Mr. Speaker, no attacks on America on our soil, not one successful one, a significant number of attempts, but not one successful attack. That is a testimonial that supports the effort, the efforts of the PATRIOT Act, the efforts of other pieces of legislation that we have done, the efforts of our intelligence personnel, our emergency personnel, our law enforcement officers, a team of Americans, and a team of people around the world who have an eye out for suspicious be-

havior, help us with our leads, and maybe we have been a little bit lucky. But we have got to be right 100 percent of the time. So far, so good.

But at this point, I see the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend, Mr. GINGREY, has arrived in the Chamber. I am quite interested in what he might have to deliver this evening.

I would invite the gentleman from Georgia to address you, Mr. Speaker. I would yield so much time as the gentleman may consume.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa, Representative KING, for taking the hour to discuss such important matters, and, of course, in a timely manner, here, one day more than 5 years from the anniversary of that horrific event on 9/11. The gentleman was mentioning, I think, earlier about people remembering, of course, where they were at that horrific time of that initial plane attack on the first Twin Tower.

We all do. We think back about that. We remember almost exactly what we were doing. Just like back in 1963, I can remember exactly what I was doing when our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was brutally assassinated. I remember exactly where I was on the campus at Georgia Tech and what meeting that I was in and who the faculty leader was at that meeting at the campus YMCA and how I left that meeting and walked slowly across campus to my fraternity house to turn on the television set where we all were glued for the next 72 hours.

That was the same shocked feeling that I felt 5 years ago yesterday when I was a medical doctor and actually in the operating room performing surgery early on that morning when the announcement was made that a plane had struck one of the Twin Towers. We thought that maybe it was a small private plane like the one that had hit the Empire State Building in New York City many years ago, with not a massive loss of life, and certainly no building came tumbling down.

So you remember. We all do, and, of course, today, as we are here back in Washington on the floor of this hallowed Chamber, talking a little bit about our memories, and why it is so important, as President Bush said, the very next day, and Representative KING has brought it out so clearly, we will not cower against this horrific enemy. We will fight them to their death.

□ 2115

We will do everything in our power as a people and the President as Commander in Chief and we as the Congress to prevent another attack on our soil.

You know the old adage, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, certainly that is true today. We can listen to all the naysayers and the criticism of what we should have done, could have done, would have done, what has gone wrong, why the plan is not perfect; but the bottom line, Madam Speaker, my

colleagues, Representative KING, we all know, is that we have not been attacked. That is not to say that it couldn't or won't occur at some time in the future, but I say we are where we are today because of the action that this President, this Commander in Chief, this Congress and our military and the will of the American people to not continue to draw lines in the sand against the Islamic extremists, in this instance, of course, al Qaeda.

But we had been attacked before, and last week when we talked about this, you know, you can enumerate date time and event, loss of life, really going all the way back to the Iran capture of the men and women at our embassy in Tehran, and then after that, of course, the bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut and the loss of 241 lives, and the first attack on the World Trade Center and the USS *Cole* and 17 of our sailors killed in that attack. And what did we do? You say you better not do that again.

As my colleague from Iowa, and I think all of my colleagues, our colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand, at some point you have got to show some real courage and respond in the appropriate manner, and that is indeed exactly what we have done.

It starts, of course, with the PATRIOT Act and the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the detention of these enemy combatants that have been caught on the field of battle in Afghanistan. Those people are not detained, whether it is at Guantanamo or these so-called secret prisons in Eastern Europe, they are not detained because they were caught jaywalking or spitting on the sidewalk, Madam Speaker. These were enemy combatants that were at the scene of the battle with literally their hands caught in the cookie jar.

We have, because of the ability to interrogate them in a humane fashion, a tough fashion, we have been able to get actionable intelligence, and that is exactly what has led to things like the capture, actually not capture, but the ferreting out and killing of al Zargawi, and finding Saddam Hussein himself and the ferreting out and killing of his two sons. This is because we were able to obtain actionable intelligence in the interrogation process.

Now we hear from the other side and all the naysayers saying, you know, you have got to be kind and warm and fuzzy and treat these people with respect. I say to my colleague, what kind of respect did they show, Madam Speaker, to those 2,997 men and women, from not just the United States, but from a lot of other countries, who were working, law-abiding individuals at the Twin Towers that fateful day 5 years ago? They were shown absolutely no mercy.

So it is important for our colleagues, it is important for the American people, to understand that this President is doing exactly what is necessary to protect this country. He is the Com-

mander in Chief. That is his first and foremost responsibility, to maintain internal order and protect us, protect the domestic tranquility and protect the American people.

So for us to have an opportunity tonight to talk about that I think is a great thing, and I commend Representative KING for leading this hour. I am proud to be here with him and will be here to listen carefully as we continue and as some of our other colleagues weigh in on this issue and discuss this further.

At this point I yield back to my colleague, but intend to stay right with him for the rest of this hour as we continue to discuss this most important subject.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on a whole variety of subjects. It appears to me whenever we have an important issue before us, we have the opportunity to hear a share of the wisdom of Mr. GINGREY, who comes to the floor quite often and carries his voice to the American people.

As I pick this up, I reflect upon a number of things, some of the things that we did and some of the stopgap measures that we put in place.

I mentioned the PATRIOT Act. That PATRIOT Act, one of the important things it did was eliminated the firewall that prevented the CIA from exchanging information with the FBI. Had that firewall not been there in place, if they had been able to exchange the information, it might well have foiled the terrorist plot that attacked the United States on 9/11.

So we looked back on where were the holes in our system and we set about fixing the holes. The PATRIOT Act fixed a lot of the holes, and we are a lot safer because we have passed the PATRIOT Act.

There was a national debate on the PATRIOT Act. There were those that came forward and said, well, it is going to infringe upon people's rights, and there will be people who will have their library cards examined, and somehow Big Brother is going to figure out what our reading list happens to be out of a public library.

That has not happened. I am not sure what the concern actually was. My reading list is all the way through my library in my office, and you can take a look at that. You can learn a lot about people if you observe their reading list and learn what is going on in their own library and what it looks like.

But libraries are one of the top locations to exchange information by spies and terrorists, because they are such an easy location for people to walk into and out of and leave information in a specified place within a book or simply have that conversation and pass the material and the information there. But also the public libraries that were opened up that had Internet access. On those computers, perhaps, was

information that can save thousands and maybe even millions of lives.

In spite of the allegations that there would be people who would be individually singled out and unjustly have their privacy invaded by the PATRIOT Act, as many hearings as we held, and I believe it was 13 hearings before the Judiciary Committee, I specifically offered a number of witnesses an opportunity to name a single case of a single individual American who had had their rights, their freedoms, their privacy trampled on, infringed, or even specifically threatened. The closest thing I got was a vague allegation about some obscure librarian in Texas that no one could chase down.

These were all specious arguments designed to undermine the PATRIOT Act. If that had been successful in doing that, your safety would have been undermined as well. But we passed the PATRIOT Act and we reauthorized the PATRIOT Act, and it was the right thing to do for America, not just in the short term, but for the long term.

It is pretty impressive to see a bill that was passed quickly in the wake of a crisis withstand that level of scrutiny after all of those hearings and all that public criticism and emerge without a single incident that can be named to a specific individual at least, only allegations. The PATRIOT Act made us safer.

The REAL ID Act makes us safer. There were at least 5 of the 19 terrorist bombers on September 11 who could have been, would have been removed from the United States if we would have been just applying the law in the local places when they had a false driver's license or when they weren't in the United States legally. We tightened this up with the REAL ID Act.

There are something like 800 different kinds of identification that come before law enforcement officers. They do a great job, but there is literally no way they can have enough knowledge to examine the validity of 800 different kinds of identification. So the REAL ID Act standardizes and raises the legitimacy up of a driver's license.

When you think about it, Madam Speaker, when you go to rent a movie, it takes a government-issued ID or a legitimate ID, a picture identification. We don't have that same kind of standard, or didn't have necessarily for climbing aboard an airplane and flying into the United States or flying out of the United States or flying around the United States.

So we tightened that up with the REAL ID Act, with an intense debate, a lot of criticism. Whenever you change things in America, people are going to rise up and resist. It is the nature of this free society that we live in that we debate these issues intensively.

It is also natural that the resistance comes up with all kinds of stories about how bad and how ugly it will be if you pass an act that changes the status quo. It is also a matter of fact, a

matter of fact, Madam Speaker, that once you pass good policy, the criticism disappears, because the cases that are alleged to have happened do not materialize if you pass good policy.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just wanted to interject as he developed this line of thought. I was at a rally in my district yesterday, we did a tribute to the 9/11 victims, and in the newspaper in Marietta, GA, there was an article, Madam Speaker, written by a former State representative who is now our chief deputy sheriff, Colonel Linda Coker, who had been to Israel with a group of law enforcement personnel to study what they do in Israel, in that small country of 6.8 million people, particularly in the city of Jerusalem and in Tel Aviv, and what their citizens have to go through to protect them from these horrific improvised explosive devices and bombs that are strapped to bodies and folks walking into shopping centers, crowded shopping malls.

The lesson, Madam Speaker, that we learned from them, and I think what Representative KING is pointing out that we need to understand, and I think the American people do now understand, is that we are not, because of what we have had to do, we all wish, pray to God, that we could go back to September 10, 2001, and enjoy that false sense of security. But now we know that we can't. And it is not about taking away our liberties, but it is very much about inconveniencing us.

Madam Speaker and my colleague, Representative KING, I just wanted to point out that Colonel Coker said when she was there in Israel on this recent trip with law enforcement, she noticed that people there when they go into a shopping mall, they go into a Parisians or whatever, they have to check their purses, they have to go through metal detectors. We fret about that because we do it on getting on airplanes, and yet they do that even going to shopping malls. But they understand that is important.

I think we just need to understand that too. I hope my colleagues agree with me that we can put up with a lot of inconveniences without infringing on our liberty for the safety and protection of ourselves and our families and our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia and appreciate the perspective that you brought to this debate.

I reflect upon some of those changes that we have seen over the years with regard to our security. I recall when we brought our security down tighter on boarding our airplanes, it ended up you were very likely to get a fairly extensive spread-eagle search if you bought a one-way ticket. That was an indicator. We all take our shoes off now. Those things happen. There are lineups at the airport.

We are paying a lot of TSA officials a lot of money to make sure we are

safer, and our baggage is going through x-rays and being checked for bombs. The list goes on and on and on.

I have two pair of nail clippers that they broke the tiny little file off the end for fear that would be a weapon. That has been relaxed somewhat. These are reminders, whenever I get the nail clippers out, that is why that is broken off. It is because of terrorists that attacked us in a cowardly way.

So after the events that unfolded in Great Britain here in the early or middle part of last month with a plot to blow up perhaps 10 airliners across the Atlantic Ocean on their way over to the United States, in that short period after that, when the regulations changed and they said you can no longer have gel or liquids with you on the airplane, so that covered one set of materials for the ladies and another set of materials for the men, no shaving cream, no toothpaste for either one of us, no lipstick in some of those cases.

My wife and I happened to have been stuck in a line that took an hour and a half to get through security. While she watched our luggage, I walked up and down the line and asked people what they thought. Everyone there was unanimous. They said, if I have to give up some liquid or gel or stand in line for an hour or longer, they are making me safe, and if it makes the airline safer, I am happy to stand here.

I am proud of that kind of patience and that kind of tolerance, and yet I do the equation and I think now a lot more people are checking their luggage because they want to carry along some liquids.

□ 2130

And the numbers of bags have gone up significantly since that period of time. And when you have to go check your baggage, it takes more time. Sometimes you can print your ticket and get on the plane if it is carry-on luggage. So perhaps it is 20 minutes more to get on, and then you have to wait for it to come off the carousel, and that might be another 20 minutes. Maybe 40 minutes of flight multiplied by the thousands of people who are in the air. And it has cost American productivity, Madam Speaker, but we are patient about it.

I do caution the American people to always remember why you are standing in that security line, always remember why you are not going to be able to carry your toothpaste or your lotion or whatever it might be. It is because these terrorists are actively plotting to attack us, to kill us because of who we are and what we stand for. They want to kill us because of our freedom. They want to kill us because of our religion. They want to kill us because of our economic success, which is why they attacked the financial centers. So while we are giving up our liquids and while we are standing in line a little while longer, Madam Speaker, I would ask all the American people to remember why that is. Keep focussed on the

real goal here. The goal is not to shed enough things out of our luggage that no one is going to be able to bring a bomb on a plane. The goal is to end the motivation of this enemy so all of our freedoms come back to us and so our children and grandchildren will live with the same sense of security and peace and safety that we have lived with all of these years. Remember the frustration. We should be a little frustrated. We should be patient. But we should understand why and who is to blame.

And I would just put it into a simple metaphor. There are thousands of people in America that lock their keys in their car. Each day it happens, I imagine, thousands of times around this country. And I think it is pretty rare for anyone to think why that is a problem. Now, we are forgetful folks and we do things by habit. When we get out of our rhythm, we might lock our keys in the car. Then we go get the locksmith or we go find another set of keys. It costs time; it costs money. But how many people who lock their keys in their car think if it were not for the thieves, there would be no such thing as car keys? And how many people that are standing in line at the airport think if it were not for terrorists, there wouldn't be a line? There wouldn't be a TSA. There would simply be people walking, getting to the gate in time to jump on the plane before the door closes, and fly off into the wild blue yonder. That is the way it was before these cowardly acts came, Madam Speaker, and that is the way I pray it is again. But it will not happen until we change the habitat that breeds this kind of terror.

And this subject comes back to me as I reflect on a conversation I had with Benazir Bhutto, who was the former Prime Minister of Pakistan. She came to Storm Lake, Iowa, Buena Vista University, to give a speech shortly after September 11, 2001. And after that speech, and it was really an impressive keynote address, I had the privilege to sit down and talk with her in a casual conversation, and it wasn't casual to me but it was casual to her, one on one in a private setting. And I asked her a series of questions, but the most central question was how do we win this war? How do you fight people that are interspersed throughout a population of perhaps 1.3 billion Muslims and in there are the al Qaeda members and the al Qaeda sympathizers? How many are there? Perhaps 130 million would be the answer that I received that night. And how do we defeat them? And former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's response was you have got to give them freedom. You have got to give them an opportunity at democracy. If you do that, they will change their focus from hatred and killing to growing prosperity for their families, their communities, their neighborhoods, their cities, their countries, and their mosques. Now, that is a very human thing to do is to grow that opportunity for the next generations. But

you have to have some control of your destiny to be able to do that. And in order to have that control of destiny, you have to have freedom.

And this country has never gone to war against another free people. It has always been tyrants and despots, never people who could control their own destiny and elect their own national leaders. And I believe free people can resolve their differences because free people have that control of their destiny and they want to continue to grow and prosper rather than live in hatred.

So I was not actually that impressed with that proposal at the time until I did a series of readings in-depth into the Islamic mindset, particularly into the al Qaeda mindset. And after I got into that pretty deep, particularly Daniel Pipes, I came out of that, and I thought I believe Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto was right, that we really do need to engage in promoting freedom. But I had simplified this down to change the habitat that breeds terror. Change that habitat. Well, it needs to be for the good. It cannot be for the worse. And that means freedom. That means opportunity. And when the President said that freedom is the right of every person and the hope and the future of every nation, I believe that. Whether it is in our time or whether it is in another time, that is the progress that we are making in that direction. And bold steps were taken by the President in the aftermath of September 11, when he said that they were going to hear us now, the terrorists were going to hear us around this globe. And many said it couldn't be done. Many said that going into Afghanistan, no one had ever succeeded in that in history; that it was too dangerous, it was too mountainous, the terrain was too rugged, the local Taliban were too good of fighters, that we couldn't risk our military to go in there. And yet in cooperation and conjunction with the Northern Alliance, we went in there. In a matter of weeks, Afghanistan was liberated. And I recall talking to some Iowa National Guard troops who were on the ground protecting the voting booths and the access and the routes to them, about 750 Iowans deployed in Afghanistan. They were there to help ensure that Afghanis could go to the polls and vote their freedom for the first time ever in the history of the world on that place on this planet. The first time. And now who would argue that the Afghan people are free? Of course they are. And they are making progress and they are moving forward. And they have their troubles, but freedom has always been worth fighting for.

And it is something that we see moving in that same direction in Iraq. Iraq has not been as easy. In fact, it has been more difficult. The liberation of Iraq took place very quickly, faster than anyone predicted, Madam Speaker, but in the aftermath there was a lull when there wasn't very much violence and it looked like Iraq was going

to heal up the same way that Afghanistan did. But, you know, Iraq has different neighbors than Afghanistan has, and Iraq became the center that brought al Qaeda to Iraq to fight Americans, fight the coalition forces, fight the new Iraqi forces because they realized, as Zarqawi realized, there was no place to retreat to. If they were to lose in Iraq, where else could a terrorist lay his weary head? Where else could they hope to have a terrorist training ground and a terrorist center so that they could gather resources and do their training and deploy their terrorists around the world? Al Qaeda needs a safe haven. We took that safe haven away from that them in Afghanistan and in the mountains of Pakistan. We took that safe haven away from them in Iraq.

Zarqawi wrote a letter a couple of years ago that said that there was no place for them to hide. There were no mountains. There were no forests. There was no place for them to hide in Iraq. They had to rely on Iraqis to take them into their homes to harbor them there. And he said in that letter the Iraqi people that were willing to harbor and provide a safe haven for al Qaeda were "as rare as red sulfur." Now, I never really got an answer to how rare red sulfur is. I would just say this, Madam Speaker. I have never seen it and I have been around a little bit. So I think it would be in the category of rare as hens' teeth or frog whiskers, something like that. That is maybe a Middle Eastern phrase, "rare as red sulfur." So they were very apprehensive then about being able to hang on to a foothold in Iraq. But Iraq has attracted al Qaeda terrorists from other places around the globe to come there to fight because they know that when Iraq is free, not only does that erase their place where they hope to be able to have a terrorist center, but it also shuts off their opportunities anywhere else in the world because what it does is it inspires the Iraqi people. When they stand up; when they become prosperous; when free enterprise starts to work; when the oil starts to pump out of the ground; when the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce, whom I gave a speech to here about a year ago and they were just so spontaneous in their response to me; when those good things happen in Iraq, when safety is established, and the oil comes out of the ground and the money flows into Iraq and they become a free, prosperous nation, an Islamic nation and an Arab nation, that inspiration that Iraq can and I believe, Madam Speaker, will become will be too much for al Qaeda, too much for the rest of the world of al Qaeda and the people within that religion who hate freedom, who hate Western civilization, who hate Christianity, who hate Americans, who hate free enterprise capitalism because the model of success would be what will defeat the rest of them. So Afghanistan and Iraq become the two lodestar nations, and

those two together are the inspiration for the Muslim world.

And as they move forward towards freedom and they want to share in that prosperity, I would just ask the world to consider what happened after November 9, 1989, when the Berlin Wall went down and the Iron Curtain came crashing down on that day and freedom echoed bloodlessly across Eastern Europe all the way to the Pacific ocean. Almost bloodlessly. Ceausescu, I think we have to exempt him from that category. And that is about the only place where the bullets flew. But in the end, the people of Eastern Europe and across Asia loved freedom. They reached out for freedom and were ready to fight for freedom. That kind of historical miracle that took place in about a 2½-year period of time can be that same kind of historical miracle for the Arab world.

So, Madam Speaker, I want the American people to understand the Bush doctrine, this goal that we have, which is to change the habitat that breeds terror and promote freedom so people can choose their own destiny. And if they choose their destiny to be something less than the freedom that we have, there is not much we can do about that, but we can encourage them to be free and make their own decisions and take a look at models around the world. And the best model, Madam Speaker, is right here in the United States. There is no place with more freedom. There is no place with more prosperity. There is no place with a stronger economy than we have here in the United States. And it is one of the places that has the strongest families and the strongest tradition of faith and Biblical values, and you put that all together. We are descended from Western civilization. We are now the leaders in Western civilization. The thought process that was descended from the Greeks and through France in the Age of Enlightenment and over to the United States at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, that dynamic that came from Western civilization coupled with the Industrial Revolution and that dynamic of free enterprise capitalism that matched with the Industrial Revolution, was tempered by and given a moral authority from our Biblical values, those three pillars are what made this Nation the great Nation that we are. And we need to be anchored in those pillars.

But I would take us back, Madam Speaker, to some situations that are just simply facts, facts that we forget about. Osama bin Laden officially declared war against the United States on August 23, 1996. He just flat came out and said, We are at war with the United States of America. He decided he wanted to take us on. That was after the World Trade Center was bombed, which was February of 1993. There were also the plotting terrorists there, and I believe that number was also five of them, that had we enforced our laws on our security, we would

have plucked them off the streets and they wouldn't have been in the mix and perhaps we could have interceded in the first attack on the World Trade Center. But that was February, 1993, Madam Speaker. And then there was an attack on the Khobar Towers in June of 1996. After that, August 23, 1996, Osama bin Laden declared war on the United States. And our response was, I guess we will have to serve a warrant on Osama bin Laden and make it a law enforcement approach rather than a war. And according to significant, credible accounts, we passed up several opportunities to take Osama bin Laden out. It would have saved 3,000 lives then and perhaps another 3,000 lives of our troops that have been in the field, not to mention the thousands of Iraqis and Afghans and our coalition troops, who have all had casualties associated with this. But I would take us into a perspective that might lay it out a little differently, and that would be 5 years ago yesterday, I was on my way down the road to the Clay County Fair. My wife called me on the phone and said, Turn on the radio. A plane has been flown into the Twin Towers.

□ 2145

I turned on the radio, a few minutes later the second plane hit the other tower. The gentleman with me said, and he is a World War II veteran, just said under his breath, "Pearl Harbor." It didn't take him five seconds to analyze what had happened. There had been another cowardly attack on the United States of a similar magnitude. And in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor, we went into an all-out global war and we fought on two fronts, in Europe and in the Pacific, and we fought the Nazis and the Japanese. And the loss of American lives in that 3½-year period of time was about 450,000 brave Americans, about the similar number of lives lost in Pearl Harbor as there was in the Twin Towers.

Since that time of the attack on the Twin Towers, this Nation has suffered not quite 3,000 killed in action. But 450,000 in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor. If you calculate that ratio or that equation, Madam Speaker, I think it indicates pretty strongly how successful this effort has been. And this is a different kind of war. It is a war that is going to go on for a long time, and it will not be over until we change the habitat of the people who get up every morning and decide they are going to come and kill us.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to interject, he is exactly right. And his friend, the veteran that was with him on that fateful morning and said, "Pearl Harbor," that attack on December 7, 1941, that day which President Roosevelt said would live in infamy, certainly it has. And as Representative KING pointed out, Madam Speaker and

my colleagues, something like 2,400, slightly less than 2,500, people were lost on that Sunday morning at Pearl Harbor in that unprovoked sneak attack by the Japanese. And the Twin Towers was very, very similar: an unprovoked sneak attack on 2,997 people.

Representative KING, I was asked recently in my district on a radio interview, and the reporter said, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, we have lost almost 2,700 of our brightest and bravest patriots. Is it worth it? And is it worth it, indeed. Losing one life is painful. It is painful for the families, of course, and for the Commander in Chief and from this Congress who gave the President the authority to wage war against these dastardly Islamic extremists. But it is worth it. It is worth it because that is the price we have to pay. I think Thomas Jefferson said a long time ago that the tree of liberty has to be nourished occasionally by the blood of patriots.

And I think about World War II. The island of Iwo Jima, that very important foothold in the mid-Pacific. In 30 days we lost 7,000 of our best generation, our Greatest Generation. But it was worth it.

I just felt like I had to make these points with my colleague and say that that is why the President says we will stay the course, we will not fail those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, and their families.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman, Mr. GINGREY from Georgia. And those sacrifices in the past have indeed been significant, and every life is equally cherished whether it is in today's conflict or a conflict back in that era.

Madam Speaker, I would pose this question: Would anyone like to be on the side of the other guys? Would anyone like to be sitting there without the resources that we have, without the firepower, without the intelligence, without the tactics that we have, without the finances to support that, and without the 300 million people that stand behind our military and the ability to go out and recruit? Our recruitment is up.

One thing that is different between Desert Storm number one and Operation Iraqi Freedom is that we had about 2.4 million people in our armed services than at the beginning of the liberation of Kuwait. Now we are down to about 1.3, 1.4, because in the aftermath of Desert Storm, there was called the peace dividend, and that is when the Clinton administration came in and decided we can provide all the money we want to grow social programs by simply cutting the military. That is the peace dividend, we are going to grow social programs. Well, a million men and women came out of uniform in that period of time, and now we sit here thinner. And I am ready to beef these numbers of troops up some more to take some of the load off of the ones that we have so they we don't have to deploy so much.

But the folks on the other side that are sitting there, and their recruitment, they have got a count of people coming into Iraq that have watched al-Jazeera TV perhaps, people that would infiltrate in from Syria and Iran, and their weapons, their munition, their funding all needs to be smuggled in to them and they have to cower and hide and sneak around like rats day and night to try to find an opportunity to detonate a bomb, not confront us face to face, but to detonate a bomb. And they know that they cannot win tactically, and they know that the only way they can win is if we lose our resolve.

And at that point, I want to point out an experience that happened to me over there in the Middle East. This is the poster of the Shia cleric Muqtada al-Sadr. Now, he is the individual that today I would say is the surrogate to the Iranians because he is a Shia, because he has been in here fomenting violence on a regular basis, and he has had his militia. And there was a time when the casualty rates from American troops on his militia and the coalition troops on his militia was so strong that he really considered take up a career in politics because he didn't have much militia left over there in those days. He has since built it up some and his militia is operating, although in a restricted fashion, within Sadr city area Baghdad.

But as I was over there a couple of trips ago sitting in Kuwait City in the hotel waiting to go into Iraq the next day, I had on al-Jazeera TV. As it came on, on TV, and Muqtada al-Sadr is a dentist, I think, he came on television. He was speaking in Arabic and they had the crawler going on underneath, so I could track him. And he said, if we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. That was June 11, 2004, and it was on al-Jazeera TV. I wish I had the tape of that. I haven't been able to quite find that. But I know what I saw and I know what I heard, Madam Speaker, and that tells us why we must prevail in this conflict.

The price for cut and run to the future of the security of this country would be cataclysmic. If we pulled out of Iraq without a government there that can provide safety and security and freedom and a tactical position in the world, if we pull out of there before those goals are reached and ensured, the price will be terrible to the destiny of the world and the security of the world, and the terrorists will be emboldened and Iraq will become their terrorist training ground, their campground, their deployment ground, the place where they would be insulated from the rest of the world because, after all, if the United States didn't come in there, if we ever pulled out, heaven help us if we ever tried back because half of the people in this Congress would stand up and resist that.

We must prevail while we are there; otherwise, that same sentiment that comes out of Muqtada al-Sadr will be on the lips of every person that is our enemy. They will think that the Americans will lack resolve. And, in fact, we would not have resolve because if any terrorist flare-up came up anywhere else in the world, if we didn't finish the job in Iraq, how do you make the case to go someplace else? How do you make the case to go to Syria?

And what if Iran continues with their nuclear build-up? How would we ever have the resolve to take that away from them, to say to them, Iran, we have decided the date that your nuclear effort will cease, and the only option to you is try to divest yourself of that nuclear capability before that day comes. Oh, and by the way, we aren't telling you what day that is. That is the kind of price that would have to be paid for the next several generations if we don't stay in Iraq and finish this job.

As General Casey said the last time I was over in Iraq, he said the enemy cannot win if the politicians stay in the fight. If the politicians stay in the fight. And yet I hear, especially on the other side of the aisle, let's get out of there, we can't win. These are sometimes the same people that surrendered before we ever got there. And they are trying to get their prophecy fulfilled by encouraging the enemy to attack us. And that encouragement of the enemy is costing American lives, and it is encouraging not only our enemy but it is encouraging the people around them, the countries around them that support al Qaeda and the terrorists within Iraq.

And the people that are doing that support comes out of Syria, it comes out of Iran. And I am starting to come to the conclusion that Iraq can't really be the safe country and the free and prosperous country that it has the potential to be as long as Iran is fomenting terror within the boundaries of Iraq.

But we know the Iraqi people love freedom. They have had a taste of freedom. And when I watched the way they react to me when I go over there, I watch the interest that they show, I am convinced that there is a future for them and they want that free future.

But if we also compare into this the Israeli situation where simultaneously Hamas attacked in Gaza and Hezbollah attacked in the north, now, what could coordinate such an attack like that? Iran. Iran whom I am reported sent tens of millions of dollars to Hamas, because Hamas, the Sunnis, weren't quite tied as tightly with Iran. So a little money helped, and they unleashed their attacks in Gaza and had to face the Israeli defense forces there. And Hezbollah, clearly a surrogate of Iran, began to fire their missiles into Israel.

Look at the violence that is being fomented, the terror that is being pushed out of Iran today, Madam Speaker. That violence that in the Middle East

is there today is rooted in Iran, rooted in Iran that just last month celebrated the centennial year of the formation of their constitution, a short-lived constitution, but a constitution that laid out the parameters for a free people. Iran has a tradition of freedom as well, Madam Speaker, and as old as it is, 100 years old, I believe the date was August 6, 1906, and to commemorate the centennial of that I hope that we move a resolution to acknowledge that date. I hope the Iranian people will be inspired to go back into the streets and grasp their freedom from the despotic rulers that are the ones that are fomenting so much terror and so much hatred, and take the control away from the madman that would continue to develop nuclear weapons and threaten to use them.

We know from historical experience that when tyrants threaten, they generally follow through. And it was the British who learned that when they tried to negotiate in Munich with Hitler. And when they came back with a letter that said we will guarantee peace for the next hundred years, it didn't last very long; it lasted until the 1st day of September 1939 when the Nazis attacked Poland. But Hitler threatened and he followed through.

Ahmadinejad is threatening. He will follow through because he is not afraid of anything. He is not deterred by a threat. He has a view that things are inevitable; and if he can kill enough people, his one religious cleric will come back, the 13th Imam or whatever his name is. And that is a radical approach to it all, but he would drive an entire people into oblivion. And if they get a nuclear weapon and the ability to deliver it, Tel-Aviv will be the first target, and he will threaten the rest of the Middle East and he will keep building missiles that will fire longer and longer until he is threatening Western Europe, and pretty soon he will be threatening the United States, just as that growing capability in North Korea has the potential within a very short time of threatening the United States.

We simply cannot let nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them into the hands of madmen. There is not a rational regime. He doesn't represent the people of Iran. The people of Iran are a modern, moderate society, and they would like their opportunity at freedom. They would like their opportunity at prosperity. And I hope that they reach up and grasp that before it is too late, before annihilation is brought upon Iran by their leader.

And so on this date, this fifth anniversary plus one day of the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers, on Pennsylvania, on the Pentagon, I wish, Madam Speaker, to thank and give gratitude to our military men and women who have so selflessly served with great courage, great bravery, great fortitude in a foreign land.

The safety that the American people have been able to enjoy over the last 5 years are to the credit also of our

emergency personnel and our intelligence system that is there and the security that is put in place. There has been a good network, Madam Speaker, and we need to be ever vigilant and ever increasing our network. There are places where we are vulnerable, and we are working to bring that vulnerability under control. But over the last 5 years we have a lot to be thankful for. We are a prosperous Nation. We have recovered from this.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 2200

Mr. GINGREY. I realize the time is drawing to a close in this hour, but I wanted to point out, Madam Speaker, to our colleagues, that of course tomorrow on the floor of this House we will have 4 hours of debate on a resolution, a House Resolution, recognizing these men and women that Representative KING just referred to, and I am talking about the first responders.

We all honored them yesterday across this Nation, the 350-something firefighters that lost their lives on 9/11 as they charged into those burning towers. I am sure that none of them thought for a moment about their own safety. They just knew that there were men and women, possibly children in those buildings that needed to be rescued.

So, again, I hope tomorrow we will have a unanimous vote on that resolution, and I look forward to being a part of that.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again. As you know, the 30-something Working Group works very hard in making sure that we bring issues that are not only facing the American people on the positive and negative end, but we make sure we encourage the Members of the House to do the right thing.

I must say, Madam Speaker, that Mr. DELAHUNT had a birthday the last time we were on the floor, a little over a month ago, and I just had a birthday. I am going to be a part of the something side of the 30-something group, and I am excited about that. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ will be joining the something side pretty soon, and Mr. RYAN will be the true blue 30.

Let me just say that a lot has happened, Mr. DELAHUNT, and I am glad that the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI, allowed us to have this hour tonight, and also working with Mr. HOYER, our Democratic whip, and Mr. James Clyburn, our chairman, and Mr. John Larson, the vice chair of our caucus, to come to the floor not only on behalf of Democrats but also on behalf